

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-I209-1

**Short Proposal Title: Adopt-A-Watershed
Leadership Institute**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

The project description contains a set of premises- which are more akin to philosophical, scientific and rational reasons that the project was originally designed and implemented. These premises serve as the ideals that the Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Institute is based on. The objectives of the program are implicit in the text of the project description, but they are not clearly and specifically written as a separate section of the proposal. There is no hypothesis associated with the proposal.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

The project description verbally defines a model of education which is based on team leadership, multiplier effects, hands-on learning, and confidence building. This section of the report however was not addressed independently. The stated premises do support the underlying basis of the proposed work, but are more ideals or beliefs, not models.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

I believe that the proposal outlines a very solid, well thought-out approach to accomplishing the goals of the project. The educational models as outlined in the project description seem to be solid, well trialed in previous years and well organized.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

This is a full-scale implementation approach that continues for three years. This is a program that has been in operation in both California and Oregon (maybe elsewhere as well) for six years.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

The potential for students and teachers to carry this information through life with them and to use this experience in future decision making capacities is always an important part of outdoor education. The adults who are being trained and educated are certainly at a place in their lives where they vote and work for environmental causes, so that is a positive benefit. Direct influence on decision making bodies, such as legislators or local government, is not a part of this program.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

The program utilizes adaptive feedback from a professional evaluator/consultant and has a proven track record on this type of proposed project. The evaluator consultant is hired to analyze all of the components of the program and present an evaluation report to the AAW staff in June of each year. Evaluations are used to assess and modify the Institute and the AAW program.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Data collected by the students are shared with community partners and other schools and communities. Both AAW and their collaborators BLOBE provide internet data exchange programs. Within the schools long term data storage in the classroom is provided from year to year.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Yes- the AAW Institute has extensive previous experience leading these trainings and appears to be capable of meeting scheduling requirements throughout the calendar year to accomplish the programs goals.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

The Adopt-A-Watershed Institute themselves have been conducting these types of hands-on workshops and leadership trainings for six years. Their staff qualifications appear to be solid and well experienced. The list of collaborators and the qualifications of individual instructors during the Institute trainings, is impressive and represents a wide-variety of perspectives, talents and skills. The proposed schedule is very tight and well orchestrated for each year's program.

Miscellaneous comments

Overall Evaluation	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
	<p>This is a very solid proposal with well thought out organization and goals that are achievable. It was difficult to review because it did not in all instances follow the CalFed proposal format. In particular, the conceptual model and the objectives and hypothesis were missing, although some of that could be found implicitly in the text of the project description. The proposed project receives an excellent rating, but the proposal itself rates as good to very good. Overall, I think that this is a very worthwhile educational program.</p>

Summary Rating

- ☐ Excellent- project is rated excellent
- ☐ Very Good- proposal is very good to good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor